

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 10 2006

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the following remarks contained herein in response to the final Office Action mailed May 10, 2006. Applicants respectfully submit that the remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance. Claims 1 – 19 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants first wish to express their sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Truong spent with Applicants' Attorney, Anthony Bonner during a telephone discussion on July 7, 2006 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Mr. Bonner and Examiner Truong discussed *Knauerhase* and *Morkel*, with respect to claim 1. Mr. Bonner indicated that neither *Knauerhase* nor *Morkel* appear to disclose "receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender," as recited in claim 1. While no agreement was met, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner Truong carefully consider this response.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the teachings of the cited art reference must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. *See, e.g., In re Dow Chemical*, 837 F.2d 469, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981). Further, "[t]he PTO has the burden

under section 103 to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. It can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.” *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

A. Claims 1 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

1. Claim 1 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2003/0023691 (“*Knauerhase*”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,007,068 (“*Morkel*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 recites:

A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of:

receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an instant messaging (IM) address of a contact of a sender;

receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, an email address of the contact of the sender;

receiving, *by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to *identify the contact* of the sender;

correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the IM address to the sender defined reference identifier; and

correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, the email address to the sender defined reference identifier (ID). (*emphasis added*)

More specifically, the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “receiving, *by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to *identify the contact* of the sender” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action states that “Knauerhase does not explicitly teach ‘receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the contact of the sender...’ Morkel teaches a sender’s computer transmits via the network to a recipient’s e-mail address an email that includes an identifier associated with the sender’s contact information” (OA p. 5, 2nd to last paragraph). *Morkel* confirms this by stating “[a] sender’s computer is also connected to the network and transmits via the network to a recipient’s e-mail address an e-mail that includes an identifier associated with the sender’s contact information” (col. 4, line 59). As stated in these passages, *Morkel* discloses that the sender’s computer transmits an e-mail with an identifier associated with the sender’s information. For at least the reason that this is different than a “sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to *identify the contact* of the sender,” claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

2. Claims 2 – 5 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claims 2 – 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 2 – 5. More specifically, dependent claims 2 – 5 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable

independent claim 1. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

B. Claims 6 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

1. Claim 6 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication Number 2004/0193722 (“*Donovan*”) and *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 6. More specifically, claim 6 recites:

A method processed by a computing device at a sender location, comprising the steps of:

receiving, by the computing device at the sender location, sender input, the sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;

receiving, *by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being *adapted to identify the individual contact*; and

correlating, by the computing device at the sender location, each of the multiple IM addresses to the sender defined reference identifier (ID).

More specifically, the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “receiving, *by the computing device at the sender location, a sender defined reference identifier (ID) from the sender*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being *adapted to identify the individual contact*” as recited in claim 6. The Office Action states that “*Morkel* teaches a sender’s

computer transmits via the network to a recipient's e-mail address an email that includes an identifier associated with the sender's contact information" (OA p. 13, 1st full paragraph). *Morkel* confirms this by stating "[a] sender's computer is also connected to the network and transmits via the network to a recipient's e-mail address an e-mail that includes an identifier associated with the sender's contact information" (col. 4, line 59). As stated in these passages, *Morkel* discloses that the sender's computer transmits an e-mail with an identifier associated with the sender's information. Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than a "sender defined reference identifier (ID) being *adapted to identify the individual contact*," as recited in claim 6. Additionally, neither *Knauerhase* nor *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Morkel*. For at least these reasons, claim 6 is allowable over the cited art.

2. **Claim 11 is Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel***

The Office Action indicates that claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of U.S. Publication Number 2004/0193722 ("*Donovan*") and *Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan* and *Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. More specifically, claim 11 recites:

A system processed by a computing device at a sender location comprising:

first receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the first receive logic configured to receive first sender input, the first sender input comprising multiple instant messaging (IM) addresses of an individual contact of the sender, the multiple IM addresses comprising IM addresses from different IM accounts, each of the different IM accounts being adapted to transmit and receive IM messages using a different IM protocol;

second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second user input comprising *a sender defined reference identifier (ID)*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to *identify the individual contact*; and

correlate logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the correlate logic configured to correlate each of the multiple IM addresses to the sender defined reference identifier (ID), the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to identify the individual contact. (*emphasis added*)

More specifically, the cited art fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “second receive logic, processed by the computing device at the sender location, the second receive logic configured to receive second sender input, the second user input comprising *a sender defined reference identifier (ID)*, the sender defined reference identifier (ID) being adapted to *identify the individual contact*” as recited in claim 11. The Office Action states that “Morkel teaches a sender’s computer transmits via the network to a recipient’s e-mail address an email that includes an identifier associated with the sender’s contact information” (OA p. 21, line 1). *Morkel* confirms this by stating “[a] sender’s computer is also connected to the network and transmits via the network to a recipient’s e-mail address an e-mail that includes an identifier associated with the sender’s contact information” (col. 4, line 59). As stated in these passages, *Morkel* discloses that the sender’s computer transmits an e-mail with an identifier associated with the sender’s information. Applicants respectfully submit that this is different than a “sender defined reference identifier (ID) being *adapted to identify the individual contact*” as recited in claim 11. Additionally, neither *Knauerhase* nor *Donovan* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Morkel*. For at least these reasons, claim 11 is allowable over the cited art.

3. Claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 are Allowable Over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan and Morkel*

The Office Action indicates that claims 7 – 10 and 12 – 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan and Morkel*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Knauerhase* in view of *Donovan and Morkel* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 7 – 10 and 12 – 19. More specifically, dependent claims 7 – 10 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claim 6. Further, dependent claims 12 – 19 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claim 11. *In re Fine, Minnesota Mining and Mfg. Co. v. Chemque, Inc.*, 303 F.3d 1294, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Further, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Anthony F. Bonner Jr., Reg. No. 55,012

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

Customer No.: 38823